

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 35, 40, and 41 are requested to be cancelled.

Claims 20 and 32 are currently being amended.

Claims 42 and 43 are being added.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 20-34, 42, and 43 are now pending in this application.

In the March 8, 2006 office action, the Examiner rejected claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being drawn to an intangible embodiment and under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as being a feature not found in the specification. In response to the Examiner's rejections, claim 41 has been cancelled, rendering the issues raised by the Examiner moot. In addition, claims 35 and 40 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as being drawn to a feature not found in the specification, and claim 40 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as lacking antecedent basis. Notwithstanding the antecedent basis issue, and solely to advance the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has canceled claims 35 and 40. However, Applicant wishes to emphasize that, in canceling these claims, Applicant is not agreeing with any insinuation that the limitation "a computer program product embodied on a computer readable medium is not inherently found in the specification. The specification and claims repeatedly refer to a telecommunication apparatus and a micro-processor in conjunction with the present invention. Such apparatuses and processors inherently involve the use of computer-readable mediums and computer program product code to operate as is well-known in the art to those of ordinary skill. In the

event that the Examiner disagrees with this position, then he is strongly encouraged to contact the attorneys for Applicant to discuss this issue in greater detail.

The Examiner rejected claims 20-24, 27-32, 34, 35, 40, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0032699 (Edwards et al.) Claims 25, 26, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,854,624 (Grant). Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections for the reasons set forth below.

In response to the Examiner's rejections, Applicant has amended claims 20 and 32 to more particularly delineate the patentability of the pending claims over the prior art. In particular, claims 20 and 32 have been amended to describe how first and second location input keys are aligned at an outside edge of the display, while first and second captions indicative of first and second links are aligned at an inside edge area of the display in close proximity to the outside edge. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable over Edwards et al.

Amended claims 20 and 32 recite a portable apparatus and an associated method for requesting the download of pages of information from a remote source. A page of information is received, where the page includes information identifying at least first and second links to other pages. At least first and second fixed location input keys are provided, where the input keys are aligned along an outside edge of a display, and captions indicative of the first and second links are aligned along an inside edge of the display in close proximity to the outside edge. These features are described in detail, for example, at Figures 3-5, page 10, lines 10-16, and page 11, lines 10-17. This allows a user of the portable apparatus to navigate to and from pages and links in an intuitive and easily-understood manner.

Edwards et al. does not disclose or suggest such a system and method. Instead, Edwards et al. teaches a system and method of recognizing WWW hyperlinks on a page, and tailoring the hyperlink description text for rendering on a specifically adapted user-interface and display, where each hyperlink on a page is associated with a numeric identifier or function button/number key from a keypad. (*See* Abstract, Figures 2 and 3, and paragraphs [0054]-[0074]). In particular, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the function

keys 335 and the hyperlinks 001-007 presented on a banner. In addition, as shown in Figures 2 and 3, the number keys 335 of the keypad 105 are assigned in numerical order to the hyperlinks 001-007 appearing on the user-interface display 205, in a left-to-right and top-to-bottom order, which corresponds to the order of the number keys 335 of the keypad 105. However, the hyperlinks on the user-interface display 205 are not presented in a constellation format, which would correspond to the mutual positions of the number keys 335 of the keypad 105. In other words, the number of hyperlink columns is illustrated to be different from the actual number and spatial placement of the number keys of the keypad. By contrast, claims 20 and 32 of the present application require that the at least first and second fixed location input keys are aligned at an outside edge of the display, and that the first and second captions, indicative of the first and second links, are aligned at an inside edge area in close proximity to the outside edge of the display. Therefore, Edwards et al. fails to anticipate all of the limitations required by claims 20 and 32.

The Examiner properly recognized that Edwards et al. does not teach or suggest touch-sensitive display features or displaying captions and visual elements immediately above a fixed location input key. However, the Examiner alleged that Grant cures these deficiencies of Edwards et al. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this position. In particular, Applicant submits that Grant does not teach the use of location input keys, captions, or visual elements as understood in claims 25, 26, and 33, and that the combination of Edwards et al. and Grant does not result in the present invention. Grant teaches integrating Internet browser command functions into a separate keypad device. (*See* Abstract and Figures 1 and 2). Specifically, the keypad device of Grant acts as another peripheral device to a personal computer. Grant notes that the majority of buttons and functions resident on a conventional computer keyboard are not necessary for Internet browsing or surfing. (*See* column 1, line 36-column 2, line 20). Therefore, buttons associated with functions such as “back,” “forward,” “home,” etc. are located on a small device. However, these functions are not analogous to the claimed fixed location input keys that are associated with links to pages. “Back,” “forward,” and “home” functions are basic navigation functions and not associated with any particular page of information.

In addition, contrary to the Examiner's assertion that the programmable buttons of Grant can be likened to the fixed location input keys of claims 25, 26, and 33, Grant merely teaches the ability to pre-assign pages to the programmable buttons 60. Grant contemplates programming favorite Web pages to the programmable buttons, which in essence is similar to assigning Web page bookmarks to dedicated buttons as described in column 5, lines 25-30. Programming bookmarks is clearly not analogous to parsing pages of information for embedded page links and associating those page links to fixed location input buttons.

Furthermore, the "captions" and "text" that the Examiner alleged is taught by Grant are merely physical labels written or otherwise affixed to the separate device. (See Figure 5). These labels are not "captions" indicative of page links as recited in claims 20 and 32 of the present application. Captions, visual elements and touch-screen capability are impossible in the invention of Grant, because as described in detail in Figure 4 and column 4, lines 41-49, the display is merely used for general information that is completely unrelated to actual page link captions or visual elements that are aligned along outside and inside edges. Figure 3 shows a display, the size of which, will not allow the claimed alignment of captions or visual elements with the physical fixed location input keys of claims 20 and 32, from which claims 25, 26, and 33 depend. Without a more precise disclosure, Grant at best, teaches that the display is capable of displaying the URL of a page that is currently open, for example.

In fact, the teaching of Grant runs counter to at least one purpose of the present invention, i.e., providing an easy-to-use interface for a portable device as discussed on page 1, line 30-page 2, line 4 of the specification. Grant requires the use of an additional device, in addition, to any existing hardware as shown in Figure 2. This would only make operating the separate device of Grant even more dangerous in a vehicle, for example, because not only would a user have to be cognizant of the separate display, such as a vehicle-mounted equipment display, but also, the separate keypad device. Therefore, for all the reasons discussed above, Grant fails to cure the deficiencies of Edwards et al.

Because none of the references cited by the Examiner either separately or in combination with each other, teach all of the limitations of claims 20 and 32, Applicant submits that each of independent claims 20 and 32 are patentable over this prior art.

Furthermore, because dependent claims 21-34, are each directly or indirectly dependent upon independent claims 20 and 32, Applicant submits that each of these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

In addition to the above, Applicant has added new dependent claims 42 and 43, which are directed to a feature for providing a display configured to display each caption associated with a fixed location input key closer to its associated fixed location input key than any other fixed location input key. Such a feature serves to reinforce the efficient and intuitive navigation properties of the present invention. Applicant submits that neither Edwards et al. nor Grant teaches such a feature. Furthermore, because these claims are directly or indirectly dependent upon claims 20 and 32, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable over the prior art for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1450. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1450. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1450.

Respectfully submitted,

Date JUNE 29, 2006

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 27433  
Telephone: (312) 832-4553  
Facsimile: (312) 832-4700

G. Peter Albert, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 37,268